

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/938,144	08/23/2001	Robert Barry Wood	STL9833/40046.150USU1	1721	
H. SANDERS	7590 01/10/2007 GWIN. JR.		EXAMINER		
SHUMAKER &	& SIEFFERT, P.A.		PARK, I	PARK, ILWOO	
8425 SEASON SUITE 105	SPARKWAY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL, MN 55125		2182	2182	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/938,144	WOOD, ROBERT BARRY		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ilwoo Park	2182		

	Ilwoo Park	2182						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension from funder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed any reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since					
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecalice					
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co			ecause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		12 50,011),						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
appeal; and/or								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-	ill be entered and an e	explanation of						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6 and 16-28</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			,					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application i							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SR/08) Paper No(e)	ILWOO PARK						
13. Other:	(1 10/06/00) 1 aper 140(s).	PRIMARY EXAMI	MER					
	1	11/2001						
		Ilwoo Park 12/20/0	8					
		HWOO FAIR 12/20/0	J					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly recited limitation (EEPROM, flash memory) with the combination of existing element of claims 1-5, 16, 17, and 25-28 requires further consideration.

The newly recited limitation (spreadsheet program, word processor program, accounting program) with the combination of existing element of claims 1-5 and 25-27 requires further consideration.

The newly recited limitation (3.5" form factor disc drive asembly) with the combination of existing element of claims 18--24 requires further consideration.

Regarding the applicant's argue of no operating system in Stefanksy, as stated earlier in col. 8, lines 25-40 of Stefanksy, the microcontroller control program run by the microcontroller in the device is the operating system running five principle tasks.

As for applicant's argue of the microcontroller of Stefanksy incapable of comprehending data stored on rotating disk because the microcontroller running any degree of complexity beyond the microcontroller control program is unlikely, the microcontroller [CPU] of Stefanksy has no problem running its tasks [applications]; however, when any task [application: col. 6, lines 4-12 in Durrett] having higher degree of complexity beyond the microcontroller is needed, the use of CPU of Durrett would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As for applicant's argue of Durrett failing to have a disc drive because Durrett discloses the local computer generally does not include a physical disk drive but can be added, Durrett clearly teaches not only the local computer adding the disk drive therein in order to execute the storage role of the virtual disk server containing needed/operated by the local computer.

As for applicant's argue of Durrett failing to teach a case forming a substantially sealed environment that includes a data disc and a CPU, Durrett shows the case [local computer held by an operator in fig. 1] forming a substantially sealed [e.g., CPU 20 inside and a disk drive inside are not environmentally exposed].